## **REMARKS**

This amendment is made in response to the Examiner's Official Action mailed February 5, 2004 in which claims 1-10 were pending. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101(a) as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 to 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Enta (US Patent 5,983,197 - hereinafter referred to as Enta).

By the present amendments, claim 10 has been amended.

## Response to the Examiner's 101 Rejection

Claim 10 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, and is now directed to a computer software product including a computer readable storage medium. Therefore we believe that the amended claim 10 is directed to statutory subject matter.

## Response to the Examiner's 102 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 to 10 under USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Enta. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The present invention relates to a diagnostics system for POS applications, in which POS appliances are not just monitored to see if a fault exists, but in which an attempt is made to diagnose the fault at the control centre, so that the fault can be fixed.

In accordance with the present invention, the helpdesk operator begins with a specific problem listed in the control unit based on a problem identified to them by the user of a POS appliance. The control unit then issues queries based on the problem selected and on the associated decision tree and obtains answers automatically or manually from the helpdesk operator.

The control unit of the present invention steps through a number of diagnostic queries in accordance with the associated decision tree and previous query results, and at each step displays the query on the display so that the operator can remain in the decision loop and can learn the methodology of the diagnosis process.

The present invention provides a flexible and user-friendly helpdesk system, which is simple to use and which teaches a helpdesk operator as to where a fault my lie and how it might be addressed so that the operator may be better able to respond to a help request in the future.

Enta neither relates to POS appliances, nor to diagnosis systems. It does not relate to the finding of solutions to faults in an appliance from a remote helpdesk, and nor does it address the training of a helpdesk operator.

Enta only discloses a monitoring centre. No mention is made of any attempt to diagnose a problem at the monitoring centre, and no mention is made of any diagnosis queries. Indeed, the premise behind Enta is to send a service person to an ATM, and so presumably Enta assumes that any diagnosis and repair will be carried out by a trained service person. No consideration is given to any training of the monitoring centre operator.

Enta does not relate to the same situation as the present invention, in which a helpdesk operator attempts to diagnose the reasons for a problem remotely so as to help a usually unskilled user of the POS terminal solve the problem.

Thus, the Enta monitoring system and ATMs cannot be interpreted as the diagnostics system and POS applications of the present claims as suggested in the Office Action.

Furthermore, Enta does not include the plurality of problems, diagnostic queries, and diagnostics rules of the present invention. As said, Enta relates to monitoring rather than diagnosis. Also, Enta is only interested in two simple status conditions of the ATMs - Are they working (yes or no), and what

is the total available amount of cash? This contrasts with a system of the present invention, where many different problems will be stored, with many different queries and many different diagnostics rules for each problem. Enta also does not mention the possibility of any queries that may be answered manually.

Nor does Enta disclose the provision of a number of decision trees, one for each of the problems. The "stages" noted in Enta are merely either to dispatch a service person or to put a service person on standby for dispatch. It does not disclose a number of possible POS appliance problems, and then a decision tree for each one of these problems.

Enta also does not disclose a diagnostics engine that displays the queries on a display, or that prompts an operator for answers to manual queries. The only display mentioned is Enta is of the result of the dispatch determination, i.e. to place a service person on standby or send them out.

In view of the forgoing, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 are clearly not anticipated by Enta, and are therefore allowable under 35 USC 102(b) over Enta.

Furthermore, claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 are patentably distinguished over Enta. Absent the teachings of the present invention, there is no suggestion or incentive to provide a remote diagnostics system in accordance with the present invention. Indeed, even with a recognition of the problems that the present invention has identified and overcome, which recognition is in itself not obvious, it would further not be obvious to look for an answer to these identified problems in an ATM monitoring system that sends out a trained service person. If one did look to Enta, it would not provide or suggest the present invention.

With respect to Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable in that they depend from allowable Claim 1 or allowable Claim 5.

Furthermore, Claims 2 and 6 relate to the display of answers to automated queries. This display of the answers themselves, rather than just displaying an end result of a diagnosis process or even the queries, assists a helpdesk operator to understand the methodology behind the diagnosis process and so helps to teach the operator about the possible faults and solutions at the same time as diagnosing a current problem. The Examiner notes that Enta teaches the display of results. However, the display of a final result is not the same as the display of answers to automated questions. Absent the present invention, there would be no reason to display an answer to an automated question e.g. midway through a diagnostics process.

Also, Claims 3 and 7 require the helpdesk operator to confirm that an automated query should be sent out. This helps an operator keep track of the diagnosis process and to follow the methodology involved in the diagnosis. Absent the present invention, there would be no reason to slow down an automated process to have an operator confirm that an automated question should be sent out. The Examiner has noted that the monitoring centre determines when to transmit an electronic query. However, in Enta, no mention is made of operator intervention, and presumably the query is sent out automatically without user intervention, as it is a timed query (e.g. every hour). This is the opposite to what is recited in claims 3 and 7. Also the queries in Enta are not part of a diagnostics process and are not determined by a decision tree and previous answers.

Finally, Claim 4 and 8 require that the diagnostics engine provide the option of answering an automated query manually. This allows a user to intervene in the automated query where they feel that it would be helpful or where the automated procedure may have problems obtaining the information. This is not disclosed in Enta. The Examiner has noted that Enta discloses that an operator may enter types of instructions manually into the monitoring centre, but these instructions will not be "answers" to queries as required in claims 4 and 8.

In view of the amendments and discussions set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the grounds for the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-10 as currently amended should now be found to be all in the condition for allowance.

Date: April 15, 2004

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted

Wendell J. Jones

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No.: 45,961

Tel No.: (650) 857-7453